REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now present in this application, with new claims 9-16 being added by the present Amendment. Claims 1 and 9 are the sole remaining independent claims.

Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weinberg et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed and is further inapplicable to new claims 9-16 for at least the following reasons.

Weinberg et al. is directed to a visual web site analysis program, implemented as a collection of software components, to provide a variety of features for facilitating the analysis, management, and load-testing of web sites. Various map navigation and URL filtering features are provided to facilitate the task of identifying and repairing common web site problems, such as links to missing URLs. A dynamic page scan feature enables users to include dynamically-generated web pages within the site map by capturing the output of a standard web browser when the form is submitted by the user, and then automatically resubmitting this output during subsequent mapping of this site.

The tool of the system of Weinberg et al. is directed to generating a test that emulates multiple concurrent users. The test can be stored as a scenario file and can thereafter be loaded and run to the test site. The test generation tool eliminates the need for user to browse the web site or actively define this scenario (see columns 2 and 3 of Weinberg et al.).

The Examiner has referenced a map comparison tool of Fig. 21 of Weinberg et al. in an effort to meet various ones of the limitations of the claims of the present application. The map

comparison tool allows the user to visualize changes that have been made to a web site since a prior mapping of the site. This can include new URLs and links, modified URLs, deleted URLs and links, and unmodified URLs and links (see column 30, lines 50-56 of Weinberg et al.).

Further, regarding the automated generation of load testing scenarios, the Examiner has referenced a section of Weinberg et al.wherein a load is produced, in which multiple client requests can be pending at one time, noting that this is commonly the case when a large number of concurrent visitors are accessing the site. This is discussed in column 32 of Weinberg et al. The Examiner attempts to utilize the large number of concurrent visitors, to meet the limitation of "wherein the at least one automation object can be worked on by a number of users in parallel" as set forth in claim 1. This assertion is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As set forth above, the Weinberg et al. system is directed to a software tool which allows the repairing of common web site problems, such as links to missing URLs. To the contrary, the present application as set forth in claim 1 is directed to an automation system which permits, among other features, at least one automation object to be stored, via an object name, in a directory. By establishing such a directory, the at least one automation object is thus accessible to and thus can be worked on by a large number of users in parallel.

The automation system includes the directory for storing object names of the at least the one automation object, and an object name assigned to a directory entry. By using such directory entries, an entry for first automation object may be stored as shown in exemplary Fig. 2 of the present application for example. By storing a directory of entries for each automation object, and by using object names associated with the at least one automation object, a system is established wherein other users can use their tools to find the at least one automation object, and

to work on or copy the associated directory thereof. **As such, multiple users will have immediate access to partial solutions which have been created; parallel working and joint working is possible; and distributed working is also possible.** Such a system overcomes problems of previous systems in which access of the user to certain data was controlled and restricted, wherein no such parallel working was permitted.

In Weinberg et al., at best, common web site problems such as links to missing URLs can be cured. This system allows for large number of concurrent **visitors** to access the site, **but this does not equate to a system which permits at least one automation object to be worked on by a number of users in parallel.** Merely visiting the site does not even permit access to at least one automation object, let alone parallel work on that automation object. Weinberg et al. provides no solution to a type of automation system which makes it possible for automation solutions to be created on a parallel and/or distributed basis, as can be achieved by the automation system as claimed in claim 1 for example. As such, Weinberg et al. cannot be held to anticipate claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Somewhat similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 9-16 are also allowable over Weinberg et al. Weinberg et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the automation system as set forth in claim 9, wherein the at least one automation object is useable by a plurality of users in parallel. As such, claims 9-16 are also allowable over Weinberg et al.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of all

outstanding objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-16 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/bof